



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,452	04/30/2001	Han C. Wen	3997P007	4448
7590 05/17/2007				
Tarek N. Fahmi				
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP				
Seventh Floor				
12400 Wilshire Boulevard				
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026				
		EXAMINER		
		DUONG, DUC T		
		ART UNIT		
		PAPER NUMBER		
		2616		
		MAIL DATE		
		DELIVERY MODE		
		05/17/2007		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,452

Applicant(s)

WEN ET AL.

Examiner

Duc T. Duong

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/26/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding to independent claims 1, 9, and 20, there does not appear to be a written description of the claimed limitation “**independent of increasing the window size for the traffic stream**” in the application as filed. It appears that applicant have incorrectly amended the claims by adding new matter for the purpose of avoiding prior art rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2616

4. Claims 1-10 and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al (US Patent 6,757,255 B1) in view of Ruutu et al (US Patent 6,219,713 B1).

Regarding to claim 1, Aoki discloses a method (fig. 12), comprising applying predictions of congestion conditions (obtaining a round trip time RTT) for a traffic stream (TCP) in a communication network (col. 11 lines 29-33) to increase an initial congestion window size for the traffic stream (col. 14 lines 43-48); the window size is increased after the slow start phase); and applying dynamic bandwidth control (calculating an effective bandwidth) to the traffic stream (col. 11 lines 33-37).

Aoki fails to teach for the initial congestion window is set up to an advertised window size of a client receiving the traffic stream.

However, Ruutu discloses a method for adjustment of TCP congestion window, wherein the congestion window 360 is adjusted according to an advertised window size 350 of a receiver 310 (fig. 3 col. 4 lines 53-65).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to employ an advertise window of a receiver as taught by Ruutu in Aoki's system to provide a more accurate and faster response to the changing network conditions.

Regarding to claims 9 and 20, Aoki discloses a communication network 1 (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 5-7) comprising one or more communication paths (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 17-20) between one or more content sources 16-18 and one or more clients 16-18 (fig. 1 col. 6 lines 12-16), at least one of the communication paths including a control node 2 (Fig. 2

Art Unit: 2616

col. 6 lines 25-33) configured to set an initial congestion window for a traffic stream (TCP) transmitted over the at least one communication path according to predicted congestion conditions (a round trip time RTT) for that traffic stream (fig. 12 col. 11 lines 29-33), increased up to an advertised window size of a client receiving the traffic stream (col. 14 lines 43-48); and to rate limit the traffic stream (calculating an effective bandwidth) to an effective bandwidth associated with a potentially congested bottleneck in the at least one communication path over which the traffic stream is transmitted (fig. 12 col. 11 lines 33-37).

Aoki fails to teach for the initial congestion window is set up to an advertised window size of a client receiving the traffic stream.

However, Ruutu discloses an apparatus for adjustment of TCP congestion window, wherein the congestion window 360 is adjusted according to an advertised window size 350 of a receiver 310 (fig. 3 col. 4 lines 53-65).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to employ an advertise window of a receiver as taught by Ruutu in Aoki's system to provide a more accurate and faster response to the changing network conditions.

Regarding to claim 2, Aoki discloses the dynamic bandwidth control comprises modulating inter-packet bandwidths (calculating the effective bandwidth or transfer speed) of the traffic stream according to a capacity (number of transmitted packets/time expended for transmission) of a bottleneck in a communication path through which the traffic stream passes in the communication network (fig. 13 col. 15 lines 11-35).

Regarding to claims 3 and 15, Aoki discloses the predictions of congestion conditions are based on one of monitoring packet losses within the communication network (col. 10 lines 19-36) or monitoring packet round trip time in the communication network (col. 8 lines 45-65).

Regarding to claim 4, Aoki discloses the monitoring is performed on at least one of a traffic stream-by traffic stream basis, a connection-by-connection basis, a link-by-link basis, or a destination-by-destination basis (fig. 3 col. 6 lines 47-55).

Regarding to claims 5 and 16, Aoki discloses the monitoring is performed for a period between 0 and 100 seconds (fig. 10; noted the difference between the session start time and the session end time correspond to a period between 0 to 100 seconds).

Regarding to claims 6-8 and 17-19, Aoki and Ruutu discloses all the limitations with respect to claims 1 and 9, except for the monitoring is performed for a period between 30 and 100 seconds (claims 6 and 17), 50 and 100 seconds (claims 7 and 18), and 60 and 100 seconds (claims 8 and 19). However, to arrange a monitoring for a plurality of intervals of 30 and 100 seconds, 50 and 100 seconds, and 60 and 100 seconds would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art since such arrangement of monitoring intervals involves only routine skill in the art, thus constituting no new inventive concept.

Regarding to claims 10 and 21 the control node is configured to rate limit the traffic stream by setting a minimum time spacing (a sliding window is uses to establishes the spacing time) between packets within the traffic stream (col. 14 lines 34-43).

Regarding to claims 12 and 22, Aoki discloses the control node is configured to rate limit the traffic stream by setting the effective bandwidth BW equal to a maximum transfer rate (number of transmitted packets/time expended for transmission) allowed by the potentially congested bottleneck in the communication path (fig. 13 col. 15 lines 11-35).

Regarding to claims 13 and 23, Aoki discloses the control node is configured to rate limit the traffic stream by applying a feedback (echo packet) control process to modulate inter-packet bandwidths in the traffic stream (fig. 12 col. 11 lines 21-29).

Regarding to claims 14 and 24, Aoki discloses the feedback control process 4 is applied at a control node 31 upstream of the potentially congested bottleneck in the communication path (fig. 11 col. 11 lines 3-20; the performance measuring device 4 performs the feedback control process).

Regarding to claim 25, Aoki discloses the at least one communication path is selected on the basis of prior packet losses thereon (col. 6 lines 43-47; the performance measuring device 2 obtains information on the performance of the TCP communications, the information include packet loss).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed February 21, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding to applicant's argument on pages 7-8, the specification paragraph [0038] discloses of the claimed limitation "**independent of increasing the window size for the traffic stream**". In response, the examiner traversed such assertion. All paragraph [0038] discloses of is how the rate limiting

Art Unit: 2616

function is used to avoid congestion. The examiner fined no such teaching of the claimed limitation performing of what applicant stated. Though the applicant claimed the limitation is inherent, such inherency would required extrinsic evidence that must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the specification, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. See *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949. Based on the reasons set forth here the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2616


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-3122. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 AM-6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DD

DD


HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600